

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1120

In re: ANDREW U. D. STRAW,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

Submitted: March 15, 2023

Decided: April 4, 2023

Before RICHARDSON and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Andrew U. D. Straw, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Andrew U. D. Straw petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order directing the United States Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina to grant him access to file pleadings through the court's electronic filing system. We conclude that Straw is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004); *In re Murphy-Brown, LLC*, 907 F.3d 788, 795 (4th Cir. 2018). Further, mandamus relief is available only when the petitioner has a clear right to the relief sought and “has no other adequate means to attain the relief [he] desires.” *Murphy-Brown*, 907 F.3d at 795 (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted).

The relief sought by Straw is not available by way of mandamus. Straw has not shown that he has a clear right to file electronically as a pro se litigant in the Eastern District of North Carolina. *See* E.D.N.C. R. 5.1(b)(1), (f) (stating that pro se litigants are not permitted to file electronically in the Eastern District of North Carolina). Accordingly, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED